UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,848	09/11/2003	Ruei-chin Luo	24061.78	5534

42717   7590   11/09/2007

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street
Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202

EXAMINER
KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/659,848	LUO ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Chuck O. Kendall	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 October 2007*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-16 and 18-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) *10 and 17* is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This action is in response to Application filed 02/06/2007.

2.   Claims 1 – 20 have been examined and are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508 in view of Beausang et al. USPN 5,703,789.

Regarding claims 1,13 and 19 Dangelo discloses a method for accessing a

plurality of memory compiler units, the method comprising:

remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit (18:1 – 5, see compile

and link);

generating a combination datasheet comprising a plurality of memory instances

(14:8 – 15, see generating data sheet).

Dangelo doesn't expressly disclose wherein prompting, via a multi-compiler

interface, for a selection of a first memory compiler unit from a plurality of memory

compiler units. However, Beausang in an analogous art and similar configuration

discloses a multiple compiler environment which utilizes a first compiler (615) which

performs a process on the generic net list of the IC (13:20 – 30), and also a second

compiler (625) is also selelcted to process to optimize the results (13:50 – 60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

Dangelo and Beausang because, it would enable optimizing more efficiently as

suggested by Beausang (4:45 – 60).

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1 further comprising:

prompting, via the multi-compiler interface, for a selection of a second memory

compiler unit from the plurality of memory compiler units (Beausang, see 13:50 – 60);

remotely linking to the selected second memory compiler unit (Dangelo, 18:1 –

5, see compile and link); and

generating the combination datasheet comprising a plurality of memory instances

created by both the first and second memory compiler units (Dangelo, 14:8 – 15, see

generating data sheet).

Regarding claim 7, the method of claim 1 wherein the prompting comprises:

requesting a user to select a link to the first memory compiler unit (Dangelo, 8:47

– 55).

6.   Claims 3 – 6, 8, 9;11,15,16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508 in view of Beausang et al. USPN

5,703,789 as applied in claim 2 and further in view of Zizzo USPN 6,578,174 B2.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, Dangelo as modified by Beausang discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 2 above. The combination of Dangelo and Beausang doesn't expressly disclose displaying the combination datasheet on a web page. However, Zizzo in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses making available data sheets and the like regarding electronic components and which is linked to remote locations (Zizzo, 6:20 – 40, see FIG. 2, 230 for internet).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dangelo, and Beausang, with Zizzo because, it would enable providing information of useful capabilities (Zizzo, 6:20 – 25).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1 wherein the plurality of memory compiler units are provided on separate servers Zizzo, see FIG 2, 260,232,234 – 244, for servers).

Regarding claims 5 and 20, the method of claim 1 further comprising providing the plurality of memory compiler units on at least two separate servers (Zizzo,FIG 2, 260,232,234 – 244, for servers).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1 further comprising providing the multi-compiler interface and the plurality of memory compiler units on at least two separate servers (Zizzo, FIG 2, 260,232,234 – 244, for servers and all associated text).

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1 wherein remotely linking to the selected

first memory compiler unit comprises:

displaying a web page associated with the selected first memory compiler unit

(Zizzo, 7:10 – 15).

Regarding claims 9 and 16, the method of claim 1 wherein remotely linking to the

selected first memory compiler unit comprises:

soliciting inputs to one or more parameters through a web-based screen display (Zizzo,

6:20 – 40, see FIG. 2, 230 for internet).

Regarding claim 11, method of claim 1, wherein the remotely linking to the

selected first memory compiler unit comprises creating a footprint based on the inputs

and displaying the footprint on a web page (Zizzo, 6:17 - 20 see footprint).

7.   Claims 12, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Dangelo et al. USPN 5,493,508 in view of Beausang et al. USPN 5,703,789 in view

Zizzo USPN 6,578,174 B2 as applied in claim 1 and further in view of Watanabe et al.

USPN 6,157,947.

Regarding claim 12, Dangelo as modified by Beausang and Zizzo discloses all the claimed limitations as disclosed in claim 1 above. The combination of Dangelo, Beausange and Zizzo doesn't expressly wherein remotely linking to the selected first memory compiler unit comprises storing the design files on a FTP server. However, Watanabe discloses in an analogous art and similar configuration transferring data between servers and the internet using FTP, further stating that FTP is a standard file transferring protocol (7:30 – 35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dangelo, Beausange and Zizzo with Watanabe because, it would enable transferring files between servers and the internet.

Regarding claim 14, the computer readable medium of claim 12 further comprising providing a plurality of memory compiler units accessible through a multi-compiler interface (Dangelo,10:50 – 60).

Regarding claim 18, the method of claim 12 further comprising displaying a footprint on a web page (Zizzo, 6:17 - 20 see footprint).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 –9,11 – 16, and 18 – 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

9.   Claims 10 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

"...calculating memory instance ratios based on the inputs and displaying the memory instance ratios on a web page".

Correspondence information

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ck.